

The accord “shows it is always possible to get an agreement when you give enough away,” said Senator Bob Dole of Kansas . . . The deal also has been heavily criticized in South Korea. Many people there see it as a diplomatic triumph for Pyongyang, which failed to dispel doubts about its nuclear intentions.

As part of the pact, which will be signed in Geneva on Friday, the United States will head an international consortium to provide North Korea with an interim supply of fuel to overcome its chronic energy shortage and, eventually, two 1,000-megawatt light-water reactors. In exchange, North Korea will abandon its existing nuclear facilities and renounce any plans to build nuclear weapons.

Gee, doesn't that sound familiar? This administration is repeating the same mistakes of Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton as President. They are running to Iran, which can not be trusted, which has lied repeatedly just like North Korea did.

And how did the Clinton deal work out? Yes, they took the nuclear facilities we provided them, but they didn't stand good behind their promise not to develop nuclear weapons. They developed them and we helped them.

Now this administration wants to do the same thing with Iran? We are still paying for the mistakes of the Clinton administration with North Korea's helping them get more nuclear power—and now this administration wants to do that with Iran? That is a huge mistake.

We need to help our friend Israel, to stop betraying them, to help our friends, to stop rewarding our enemies, because the consequences to this Nation will be dire if we don't turn this around.

Madam Speaker, it is my prayer—it is my hope—that this administration will turn from its stupid ways. The arrogance that existed before ObamaCare kicked in surely should have come down a notch so that they can realize maybe we are making a mistake in dealing with bloodthirsty people in Iran as well.

This country's future is at stake. That ought to be enough to make this administration slow down and realize they are about to make another huge mistake that we will pay for for generations if they don't stop. Iran will certainly not stop just as North Korea did not. They had gotten help from North Korea. They learned the lesson from North Korea. It is time this administration learned a lesson from our mistake and from the mistake of the Clinton administration and Madeleine Albright.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, everyone has heard about “The Price is

Right,” but on C-SPAN tonight, we are going to play “The Price is Wrong.” Before doing so, I want to put this in perspective.

A number of years ago, we were all aghast as taxpayers—even here as Members of Congress—when we found out that in the Department of Defense we were spending \$436 on a hammer, that we spent \$7,600 on a coffee urn, and that—oh, yes—we spent \$640 on a toilet seat. Talk about flushing money down a toilet—we were doing it—but that fleecing that we thought had ended has actually continued.

Since 2010, the inspector general of the Department of Defense has found that we are spending more than \$430 million over what we should be paying for spare parts—thousands of spare parts. So we are paying much more than the fair or reasonable price for these parts. What the military should do when it needs parts is go to what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, DLA—it is sort of like the defense hardware store—but sometimes they think it is cheaper and, maybe, faster if they go to a defense contractor and ask for those parts.

These audits also showed that the certain parts we have in such volume will last us 100 years. That is like having spare parts like, let's say, horseshoes dating back to World War I, and they are sitting around the defense hardware store today—more than 100 years' worth of certain spare parts. You might think maybe this is a little complicated, but it is really not complicated. The auditors go to the Department of Defense databases, and they can tell immediately, with just a click, whether or not these spare parts are in stock and how much they will be charged for those spare parts.

So let's play our very first game of “The Price is Wrong.”

This is a ramp gate roller assembly. It is about the size of a quarter. This particular assembly sells for \$7.71 in the defense hardware store. The auditors suggested—maybe because this is, in fact, for a Chinook helicopter—that it could be even a little bit more. What did the personnel within the Department of Defense pay for this little assembly? It wasn't \$7.71. Was it perhaps \$77.10? No, it wasn't \$77.10. Was it \$771? No, it wasn't \$771. We paid for this \$7.71 part \$1,678.61.

The price is wrong, and the Department of Defense has got to clean up its act.

Let's move on to yet another game that we can play. It is called “That's Too Much.”

I am going to show you another part. This is a bearing sleeve, and you are going to tell me whether or not you think the price is too much. At the local hardware store, this would sell for \$6. Again, this is for a Chinook helicopter. The inspector general says maybe, for this sophisticated helicopter, it would cost \$10 for this part. So, what did we pay for this part? Did we pay \$86? No, we didn't pay \$86. Did

we pay \$286? No, we didn't pay \$286. We paid \$2,286 for this little part. Now, we didn't just buy one part. We bought 573 of these parts, of this little bearing sleeve, and it cost us \$1.3 million.

All right. If you haven't enjoyed playing this game so far, we have one more game to play tonight. This game is the finale. It is called the “Showcase Showdown.” This is when we compare two packages and see which one costs more.

Our first items here are two simple ramp gate roller assemblies. Now, which is more expensive—these two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France, for two, including airfare and hotel for four nights? Which is more expensive? If you guessed the trip to Paris, France, you would be wrong because a trip to Paris, France, if you go on one of the local Web sites, would cost \$2,681, and we paid—or, I should say, the Army paid—\$3,357 for these two ramp gate roller assemblies.

The Pentagon is playing games with taxpayer dollars, and let me tell you that this is just the tip of the iceberg. The worst part of this game is that it is rigged. The contractors always win, and the taxpayers always lose.

The inspector general found that the Army overpaid one defense contractor \$13 million but that the Pentagon only recovered \$2.6 million. Now get this: it is discovered that one defense contractor overcharged us \$13 million for a number of parts, and then after it was exposed, they didn't even refund us what they should have. They only paid us back \$2.6 million. It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits and overpaying by \$16,000 for a structural support that should have cost only \$1,300.

Now, this bearing sleeve that I just showed you that was over \$2,200, let's put it in kind of simple terms.

If we went into a local cafe and ordered the blue light special and the menu said it was \$2,200, we would walk right out, and they would be laughed out of our community—but no, that doesn't happen in the military. As for that defense contractor who overcharged us and then didn't even pay us back what they had overcharged us—get this—the Air Force has just signed on the dotted line a contract with this defense contractor to do the following: to manage the supply chain. It is almost laughable that the defense contractor who ripped us off now has another contract to manage the supply chain.

Those are all of the games we have for tonight. Thank you for playing. We will see you next time on “The Price is Wrong.”

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.